

Application No. 09/539,346
Amendment dated September 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 14 and 15 are allowed. Claims 16-28 are cancelled without prejudice pursuant to an election requirement. Accordingly, claims 1-13 are at issue.

Initially, applicant wishes to acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8-13, and the allowance of claims 14 and 15. To this end, claims 8 and 11 are rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base claim 1 so as to put these claims and the claims dependent therefrom, i.e., claims 9, 10 and 12, 13, respectively, into condition for allowance.

The drawing objections are addressed by proposed drawing corrections made to FIG. 1 shown in red attached hereto. Particularly, reference numbers 32 and 70 are added to FIG. 1, and reference number 37 is added to designate the upstanding guide with an appropriate change made to the specification, at page 13, line 7 where the guide is referenced.

The objection to the specification is addressed to change the word "defraction" to -diffraction- and the word "elongate" to the word -elongated-.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Khutoryansky et al. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Khutoryansky et al. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ruud in view of Khutoryansky et al. Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ruud and Khutoryansky et al. further in view of Curry. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ruud and Khutoryansky et al. Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ruud and Khutoryansky et al. in view of Ergun et al.

The rejections, as they may apply to the claims presented herein, are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus including an x-ray head that is adjustable in three mutually transverse axes and includes a frame for supporting the x-ray head, along with x, y and z axes adjustment mounts of the frame. As amended, claim 1 also requires a detector for sensing the x-ray energy from the part with the frame supporting both the head and the

detector and each of the adjustment mounts operably connected to both the head and detector for adjusting them in the x, y and z axes directions.

None of the cited art shows a frame that supports both an x-ray head and detector and which includes x, y and z axes adjustment mounts for moving both the head and detector in the corresponding axes of movement. Instead, Khutoryansky et al. teach an arrangement of imaging equipment in a common patient x-ray examination room whereby an x-ray head 112 suspended from the room ceiling is provided with multiple axes of movement separate from an imaging media cassette 128 suspended from the room ceiling and mounted to the structure which includes the patient table 116. Accordingly, Khutoryansky et al. lack detectors operably supported by the same frame as the x-ray head, as required in claim 1. As a consequence, Khutoryansky et al. also fail to disclose or suggest the provision of three adjustment mounts of the frame for adjusting both the head and detector in the corresponding axes of movement, as set forth in claim 1. Ruud, although showing both an x-ray head and detectors, lacks any teaching of a frame structure, and certainly does not disclose or suggest the provision of a frame including the three different adjustment mounts, as required by claim 1.

Moreover, claim 1 further requires at least one fine adjustment mount of the frame for providing finer adjustments of the head and detector in one of the x, y and z directions than the corresponding one of the x, y and z axes adjustment mounts. The recited fine adjustment mount allows the head and detector to be moved rapidly via rough adjustments provided by the one x, y and z adjustment mount, and to move more precisely via fine adjustments provided by the fine adjustment mount. Neither Khutoryansky et al. nor Ruud disclose or suggest anything with respect to a fine adjustment mount, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed claim 1, and claims 2-7 and added claim 29 which depend cognately therefrom, are allowable over the relied upon references.

Application No. 09/539,346
Amendment dated September 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2003

Based on the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7, and consideration and allowance of claim 29, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Stephen S. Favakeh
Registration No. 36,798

Date: September 22, 2003

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 South LaSalle, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: 312/577-7000
Facsimile: 312/577-7007



1/13

